

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
LIBRARY
AUG 22 1955
RECEIVED

THE
JOURNAL OF THE CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION
REVUE DE L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE
LINGUISTIQUE

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 1 (REGULAR SERIES), MARCH, 1955

EDITOR: M. H. Scargill

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: W. S. Avis, J. B. Rudnyckyj

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Lexicographic Challenges of Canadian English C. J. Lovell	2
Quelques Traits phonétiques d'une Paroisse gaspésienne Jean-Denis Gendron	6
Speech Differences Along the Ontario-United States Border: Grammar and Syntax W. S. Avis	14
Linguistics at the University of Montréal J. P. Vinay	20
La Société du Parler français au Canada Gaston Dulong	22
Canadian English and Canadian Culture in Alberta M. H. Scargill	26
Book Reviews	30

OFFICERS OF THE CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION

President, Henry Alexander; Vice-President, Gaston Dulong;
Secretary, M. H. Scargill; W. S. Avis, J. B. Rudnyckyj

Subscriptions to the Association and manuscripts for publication
should be addressed to M. H. Scargill, University of Alberta,
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Subscription for the year 1955: two dollars. The *Journal* is
published in March and October. Subscribers receive the *Journal*.

· LEXICOGRAPHIC CHALLENGES OF CANADIAN ENGLISH

by

C. J. Lovell, Illinois

As a mountaineering enthusiast who holds a life membership in the Sky Line Trail Hikers of the Canadian Rockies, as well as the 1,000-miles emblem of the companion order of Trail Riders, I have made acquaintance with persons from most of the provinces. Mentions of my lexical interests, tracing word origins, have often given rise to impromptu discussions of Canadian speech. These trail-side sessions, while interesting, have rarely proved instructive; the average Canadian is seemingly better informed about American speech than the American is about Canadian, but neither is familiar with the background of his own language. A minority were of the opinion that Canadian English is essentially British English, citing the prevalence of *-our* and *-re* endings, as in *labour* and *centre*, together with such variants as *analyse-analyze*, *licence-license*, *cheque-check*, and *pyjamas-pajamas*. A Kansan observed, "Canucks say 'in hospital', just like in British whodunits, and not 'in the hospital', like we do." Admitting such distinctions, the majority nonetheless felt that Canadian English differs little from standard American English. Indeed, one Calgarian tartly declared, "We talk like Yankees. Of course, we hadn't ought to, but how can we help it? Hollywood sends us all our movies. Our papers are full of your trashy comics. You Yankees write all our bestsellers."

Enquiries about specific Canadianisms met with little response. *Canuck* was the only one commonly suggested; but prodding elicited *concession*; *McIntosh apple*; *muskeg*; *pemmican*; *prairie*; *Red River cart*; *remittance man*; *saskatoon*; *seignory*; *timber limit* and *whisky-jack*. Of the dozen terms, all except *McIntosh apple*, *Red River cart*, and *remittance man* are to be found in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, while the *Dictionary of American English* lists only *Canuck*, *muskeg*, *pemmican*, *prairie*, and *Red River cart*. The recent *Dictionary of Americanisms*, edited by M. M. Mathews, contains eight of the suggested Canadianisms, excluding only *concession*, *muskeg*, *seignory*, and *timber limit*.

Turning first to the OED and its Supplement, we see that its documentation is rather spotty, for there are but single citations of *concession* and *timber limit*, dated 1846 and 1876, respectively; while *seigneury* (the OED's preferred spelling) dates only to 1903, in the sense of a Quebec feudal landed estate, and to a pair of 1895 citations, in the meaning of a mansion. *Canuck* is exemplified from 1855, *muskeg* from 1865, and *saskatoon* from 1875. *Prairie* is cited *ante* 1682, as the name of a field in France; while *pemmican* is carried back to 1801 and *whisky-jack* to 1772. Few of the entries give a clear picture of the historical significance of the words in question, having been presented only to the extent that they may have attracted the attention of British travellers.

However much we may regret it, it was clearly beyond the purview of the *OED* to have endeavoured to trace the antecedents of these words upon North American soil. Contrary to the general belief among the less informed, that work was not intended to function as an authority upon worldwide English usage. As the pioneer effort in the field of historical lexicography, the chief aim of the dictionary was to set down, in black and white, the development of the English vocabulary in its homeland, from its roots in Anglo-Saxon, Norman French, Latin, and numerous other tongues. An examination of the *OED*'s treatment of a few of the words used in the preceding sentence should serve to indicate the magnitude of the task of the editors in fulfilling the above aim. The apparently simple little word, "as", is recorded from A.D. 1000, with 336 citations; "in" and "the", both of which go back to *ante* 700, call for 775 and 493 citations respectively; the various significations of "to", dating to *circa* 875, require 1,023 quotations; and the verb, "set", which has its origin *circa* 725, occupies no fewer than 55 columns, with at least 3,000 quotations. On the other hand, "lexicography" (1680) needed but five citations; "vocabulary" (1532), 31; "homeland" (1670), four; and "effort" (1489), ten; being technical terms with limited shades of meaning, they naturally took less exemplification. Altogether, the multifarious word-histories of this single demonstrational sentence required approximately 9,800 quotations, or slightly more than one-tenth of the quantity comprising the *DA*. Considering the above, one can understand that there was neither editorial time nor dictionary space for comparable studies of the word-stocks of English-speaking peoples overseas.

Passing on to our New World lexical authorities, the *DAE* and *DA*, we note that the former, copying the *OED* Supplement, traces *Canuck* only to 1855, as against the latter's 1835. The *DA* also recognizes *Canuck* as a label for the little Canadian horse or pony, borrowing its first (1860) example from the *OED* Supplement. Having missed this, the *DAE* dismisses *Canuck* as an attributive, hiding its 1862 example of *Canuck pony* under the notation, "of or pertaining to Canada". As for the *McIntosh (Red) apple*, the *DA* has evidence from only 1913 down to date, but pushes *pemmican* back to 1791, as against the *DAE*'s 1804. The *DA* ignores *muskeg*, while the *DAE* cites U.S. evidence from 1898. *Prairie* and its many combinations form important entries in both dictionaries, the *DA* having 322 citations, going back to 1770, and its predecessor 367, dating from 1773. The *DAE*'s 1861 quotation of *Red River cart* is buried among several attributives, while the *DA*'s examples do not go back beyond 1905. Also, its initial evidence for *remittance man* dates only to 1924, and for *saskatoon*, to 1902, while it borrows its earliest (1839) quotation of *whisky-jack* from the *DAE*.

Cross-checking of the dictionaries discloses that only four of our original dozen terms are unchallenged Canadianisms, there being none but Canadian evidence for *concession*, *seignory*, and *timber limit* in the *OED*, while both here and in the *DAE* *muskeg* is marked Canadian. The other eight words are in the *DA*, wherein an Americanism is defined as "a word or expression that originated

in the United States". Despite these claims, I agree with the proposers that the entire dozen words (with the possible exception of *prairie*) are innately Canadian. It is not sentiment that dictates this opinion, but cold facts. There are certain lexicographic faults to which scholars have too long been blind, not the least myopic being dictionary editors themselves. I cannot unhesitatingly accept every *ex cathedra* judgement of the historical dictionaries, knowing that the credibility of their entries is occasionally weakened by circumstances governing their selection of evidence.

A common deficiency is the basing of entries upon citations drawn wholly from secondary sources. The *OED*, depending upon works about Canada, rather than from Canada, hit upon few primary sources, except where scientists bestowed names upon plants and animals, or where travellers happened to dwell upon Indian linguistics. Its solitary examples of *concession*, *seignory*, and *timber limit* add little to our store of knowledge about these important Canadian words. It required but a few minutes to turn up examples of *concession* in Charles Stuart's *Emigrant's Guide to Upper Canada* (1820), and in Joseph Bouchette's *British Dominions in North America* (1831); and of course it often occurs in present-day Ontario newspapers. Early evidence for *seignory* goes back at least as far as the English text of the Articles of Capitulation of Montreal (1760); and it is to be found in Charles J. Stewart's *Short View of the Eastern Townships in the Province of Lower-Canada* (1815), as well as in Bouchette. *Timber limit* is readily located in 1864 issues of the *Globe* (Toronto), as well as in current newspapers.

Another error is drawing false conclusions from too restrictive samplings, for it is extremely risky to work from a frame of reference consisting of a solitary out-of-context quotation¹; editorial ignorance of a people, their history, and institutions, may result in such a blunder as the *OED* Supplement's synonymy of *Prairie Provinces* with *prairie states*, in a 1924 quotation. Similarly, Webster renders the Cree name of the *saskatoon* as, literally, "fruit of the tree with much wood", while anyone familiar with the dwarf, clumpy habit of the shrub would realize that "much wood", suggesting massiveness, fails to convey the Indian idea, which was simply "many branches".

Another grave error lies in the refusal to pursue research in New World English beyond the St. Croix and St. John, the Great Lakes and 49th Parallel, then labelling as Americanisms words that are our common property, and that may well have arisen in Canada. In this manner the *DA* has Yankeeified the *McIntosh apple*, when a monument to its discoverer exists in southern Ontario, and the fruit was described as early as 1879, in a report of the Montreal Horticultural Society. Likewise, the city of *Saskatoon* was settled a score of years before the *DA*'s first example of the name, which occurs as early as 1823, in Sir John Franklin's *Narrative of a Journey to the*

¹For instance, a recent reference to payment of a fine for a "C.T.A. offence", in the *Montreal Star*, was at first meaningless to me, and could have been guessed at as an abbreviation for "Canada Traffic Act". Then an 1899 example, from the *Yarmouth (N.S.) Telegram*, referring to an arrest for drunkenness, not only gave an idea of the long history of the term, but led to the surmise that it indicates some such combination as "Canada Temperance Act". Am I right?

Shores of the Polar Sea. Again, the DA's first (1791) citation of *pemmican* is from a Canadian fur company journal; moreover, previous Canadian evidence occurs in James Isham's *Observations on Hudsons Bay* (1743), and in the *Cumberland House Journal* (23 September, 1777). Isham also has *whisky-jack*, antedating the DA by 96 years. *Red River cart* was in print by 1851, while *remittance man*, if I remember correctly, appears in *The Western Avenger*, by Morley Roberts (1887); if not, it is foreshadowed by *remittance grabber* and *remittance farmer*, in Alfred O. Legge's *Sunny Manitoba* (1893).

Only two of our dozen words remain to be antedated from Canadian sources; lacking time to undertake research in likely quarters, I can only point the finger of suspicion in their direction. A key to the probable Canadianism of *Canuck* occurs in a Yankee paper, the *Boston Transcript* (7 February, 1840), where it is noted as a term applied to French-Canadians by "Her Majesty's provincial subjects of English and American extraction". As for *prairie*, the first evidence in print relates to French settlements in the Illinois country, so that it should be looked for in areas of French influence in Canada.

Other words that will bear looking into are such French-Canadianisms as *rousseau*, *siffleur*, *pose*, and *travois*; their inclusion in the DA to my mind constitutes an unwarranted claim that they "first became English in the United States", since it ignores the greater likelihood that they were first adopted by fur-trade colleagues of the voyageurs. Also to be considered are Canadian references to such Indianisms as *caribou*, *pekan*, *muskellunge*, and *pembina*, derived from tongues of tribes that roamed at will through parts of both our countries.

American English itself has been so inadequately researched² that we cannot well expect American lexicographers to spare precious time in examination of alien materials, the net result of which might be the negation of long-cherished "Americanisms". The backgrounds of Canadian English therefore represent a virgin field for lexical research, offering a challenge to action upon the part of every philologically-inclined scholar. Hoping to give impetus to plans for an eventual Dictionary of Canadian English, based upon historical principles, the writer will welcome the views of fellow members of the Canadian Linguistic Association, which may be addressed to me at *The Strawberry Patch*, R.F.D. 2, Oak Lawn, Illinois.

²Fifteen years' experience in lexical research inclines me to the belief that fully 50% of the nineteenth century words in the DAE and DA are capable of being antedated; while their twentieth century terms are virtually 100% antedateable. Not a few antedatings may be gleaned from Canadiana, as witness: *The Globe* (Toronto), 2 January, 1864, has union meeting, dating from 1871 in the DA; emigrant agent (1868); and ice creeper (1875); as well as farm lot, not carried beyond 1742 by the DA. The issue of 26 September, 1864, contains democrat wagon (1871), and TD pipe (1889). *The Victoria Colonist*, 22 March, 1864, has discovery claim (1897). In the *Yarmouth (N.S.) Telegram*, 6 January, 1899, appears maid of honour (1906); on 13 January it carries Y (1920) and Atlantic liner (1901); while animal cracker appears in several ads as early as 30 March, 1900, as against the DA's 1925 first evidence. Charles Stuart's *Emigrant's Guide to Upper Canada*, 1820, has deeded land (1872). *The Statistical Account of Upper Canada*, by Robert Gourlay, 1822, includes board of education (1872); furthermore, one page carries antedatings of four words that the DA does not have beyond 1838, 1839, 1846, and 1849, respectively.

QUELQUES TRAITS PHONETIQUES D'UNE PAROISSE GASPESIENNE

par

Jean-Denis Gendron, Université Laval

L'enquête linguistique, faite durant l'été de 1954 sur la côte sud de la Gaspésie, à Bonaventure, s'insère dans un groupe d'enquêtes dont le but est d'établir un Atlas linguistique de la région gaspésienne.

Comme on a déjà décrit cette région dans ses grandes lignes et signalé sa richesse en matériaux linguistiques¹, nous nous contenterons, dans cet article, de faire les remarques générales qui s'imposent sur la paroisse qui nous intéresse, et de donner un bref aperçu phonétique des matériaux recueillis.

Bonaventure, une des plus vieilles paroisses de la côte sud de la Gaspésie, fut fondée vers 1774 par des Acadiens en quête de terres nouvelles où habiter. Depuis lors, ceux-ci se sont multipliés au point de former l'agglomération la plus considérable du comté, et ce, presque sans apport d'immigrants étrangers. Il ne s'y est infiltré que quelques familles canadiennes-françaises, selon le géographe Raoul Blanchard, et aujourd'hui encore, les habitants de l'endroit distinguent nettement les Acadiens des Canadiens-français qu'ils appellent "les Canadiens". Quant au groupe anglophone, il se réduit à quelques familles d'agriculteurs, exerçant une influence fort restreinte au sein de la population.

Nous nous trouvons donc devant une des paroisses les plus homogènes du sud de la Gaspésie, quant à la composition ethnique de la population. C'est ainsi, d'ailleurs, que la considérait James Geddes, vers 1890, puisqu'il dit de Bonaventure qu'elle est: "The most thoroly [sic] French-Acadian town along the bay."²

C'est de plus, aujourd'hui, une paroisse presque essentiellement agricole. La pêche, qui s'y est pratiquée longtemps sur une assez large échelle, a grandement perdu de son importance, ces dernières années, comme moyen de subsistance. Et d'industries, il n'y en a pour ainsi dire pas, sauf une scierie qui n'est d'ailleurs en activité que de façon saisonnière. L'agriculture reste donc la ressource fondamentale pour assurer la subsistance, dans les limites de la paroisse, évidemment.

En effet, comme moyens additionnels interviennent le travail saisonnier comme bûcheron, et, avec la découverte récente et l'exploitation de ressources minérales dans le centre de la Gaspésie, l'émigration, pour le moment temporaire, du chef de famille vers un gagne-pain nouveau et lucratif.

Mais la Gaspésie, naguère encore pays lointain et presque fermé, s'est, avec le développement du système routier et grâce à l'afflux

¹Cf. Gaston Dulong, "L'Atlas linguistique de la Gaspésie", dans la *Revue de l'Association canadienne de Linguistique*, 1 (1954), pp. 23-25.

²James Geddes, *Study of an Acadian-French Dialect*, pp. 54-55.

d'argent occasionné par la guerre et l'après-guerre, définitivement ouverte aux nouveautés de la vie moderne. "L'ancien temps" est chose tout à fait révolue, et là comme ailleurs l'agriculture s'est motorisée, et les métiers traditionnels et occupations propres à une vie économique fermée tendent à disparaître ou sont complètement disparus.

Cependant, nombreux sont encore les vieillards de soixante-dix ans et plus, chez qui le souvenir de l'ancien mode de vie reste vivace et avec lui le vocabulaire qui s'y rattache. Nous en avons pour notre part questionné au moins six, dont trois d'une façon plus poussée, parce qu'ils s'évéraient pour diverses raisons comme de meilleurs informateurs. La liste qu'on nous avait fournie contenait au bas mot vingt-cinq noms de personnes, qu'il y aurait eu intérêt à questionner.

Paroisse de composition ethnique homogène, presque essentiellement agricole, mais où le vocabulaire de la pêche reste fort vivant, riche d'un grand nombre d'informateurs bien au fait des choses du passé, Bonaventure constitue un excellent centre d'enquête, où nous avons pu faire une riche cueillette de matériaux linguistiques, de ceux-ci nous voudrions vous donner un aperçu phonétique dans les lignes qui vont suivre.

La phonétique des habitants de Bonaventure—celle des gens de soixante ans et plus surtout—présente à l'observateur attentif deux traits particuliers, fort intéressants à étudier: l'un, à cause de sa rareté ici même au Canada d'expression française, l'autre, parce qu'il est le témoin très ancien d'une prononciation jadis fort répandue dans l'ancienne langue française.

Le premier de ces traits phonétiques est une prononciation bien particulière de la voyelle nasale *on*. Celle-ci en position finale ou tonique est prononcée presque *an*, mais plus ouvert et un peu plus bref, semble-t-il, que le son *an* du français actuel.

Nous avons pu noter cette permutation de son dans les mots suivants:

Moutan	pour	Mouton
Nam	"	Nom
Charban	"	Charbon
Mande	"	Monde
Fand	"	Fond
T'nan	"	Tenon

dans la bouche d'un informateur de 82 ans;

S'élonger	pour	S'allonger
Sauman	"	Saumon
Lang	"	Long
Plamb	"	Plomb
Flacan	"	Flacon

dans la bouche d'un autre informateur de 67 ans.

Un autre vieillard de Bonaventure nous a dit que cette prononciation était générale autrefois en cette paroisse. Elle y est encore assez répandue chez les vieilles personnes, a-t-il ajouté, surtout chez celles qui sont illettrées.

Nous avons même relevé cette prononciation chez une jeune fille de 17 ans de Saint-Siméon, paroisse située à quelques milles de Bonaventure. Et le bref séjour que nous avons fait à Caplan, non loin également de Bonaventure, nous a permis de constater le même phénomène, au moins chez deux vieillards respectivement âgés de 75 et de 80 ans, tous deux illettrés.

Mais il y a plus. Le son *on* oscille parfois entre la sonorité *an* et la sonorité *in*. Cette prononciation est cependant plus rare.

C'est ainsi que dans la bouche d'un vieux forgeron de Bonaventure,

Forgeron	était prononcé presque	Forgerin
Bouton	" " "	Boutin

Le même vieillard de Bonaventure m'a dit qu'autrefois

Chaudron	se prononçait	Chadrin
Pont	" "	Pin

James Geddes avait d'ailleurs noté ce phénomène phonétique dans l'enquête qu'il fit sur la côte sud de la Gaspésie, à Carleton, vers 1890. Voici ce qu'il dit à ce propos: "I paid more attention to the nasals in Bonaventure . . . just because I was told in Carleton that the nasals were more peculiar in Bonaventure than elsewhere along the shore".³

Et il continue un peu plus loin: "It was the opinion of the school-teacher at Bonaventure and likewise that of the Carleton teacher that the nasal was not that heard in French *on* but rather that heard in Fr. *en*. To my ear, the sound heard for Fr. *on* in these cases was not only Fr. *en* but approached *in* and was *in*, as I distinctly noted at times."⁴

Cette longue citation a sa raison d'être ici, d'abord pour marquer que cette "prononciation particulière" n'est pas le seul fait de Bonaventure ainsi que semble le penser Geddes, mais qu'elle s'étend à Saint-Siméon et à Caplan comme nous l'avons déjà signalé; il restera à vérifier si ces deux paroisses n'ont pas été fondées par des émigrants de Bonaventure, ce qui expliquerait l'existence du phénomène, et d'autre part, si ce dernier ne se rencontre pas dans les autres paroisses, qui bordent la côte sud de la Gaspésie, en allant vers Carleton.

Il convient de signaler en second lieu que Geddes avait raison de prétendre qu'il entendait un son *in* "approached" ou "distinctly noted at times", ainsi que notre oreille à nous, en plus de la confirmation apportée par une de nos informateurs, nous l'ont prouvé.

³James Geddes, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-55.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 55.

Ajoutons, pour être dans l'entière vérité, que ces sons *an* et *in* ne sont pas toujours très nets, mais imprécis, indécis, fuyants, si l'on peut dire, en bien des cas.

Citons, pour donner au lecteur une idée plus complète de la nature du phénomène, une partie du commentaire de Geddes sur le sujet:

This feature, as far as I can judge from Thurot's observations on the nasal vowels, does not go back to old French. In regard to *o* followed by *n* or *m*, Thurot says: "Il semble qu'au XVI^e siècle, l'*o* nasal ait été un *o* grave moins complètement nasalisé que l'*o* nasal d'aujourd'hui." He has previously remarked that long after the XVIth century, nasality may not have been so completely confounded with the vowel as today. The cases of permutation of Fr. *an* and *on* are rare. Therefore the above cases appear to be modern and due simply to unrounding.⁵

En effet, Thurot ne cite que quelques cas de permutation de *an* et *on*, en tout neuf, tels par exemple:

Chalon	/	Chalan
Goudron	/	Goudran
Autom	/	Autan
Dommage	/	Dammage

Si une étude des caractères phonétiques de la langue française des quatre derniers siècles procure peu de satisfaction à qui cherche à rattacher le phénomène à l'évolution phonétique de cette langue, peut-être une étude des dialectes d'oïl serait-elle d'un autre secours.

En effet, quelques remarques de Grevisse, à propos de la prononciation française en Belgique, semblent l'indiquer. Il dit que: "En Hesbaye et à Huy, *an* se rapproche de *on*: *Un franc* prononcé à peu près *un fron*." "A Neufchâteau, *an* tend à se rapprocher de *in*, par l'effet d'une nasalisation trop forte: *Ange* prononcé à peu près *inge*." En Hesbaye, dans le pays gaumais, dans le Limbourg, en Campine, la nasale *on* sonne souvent comme *an*: *Bonbon* est prononcé *banban*.⁶

Il est vrai que Grevisse n'indique pas si ces prononciations sont des particularités phonétiques propres aux seuls Wallons; vu que les "pays" où ces faits sont signalés sont en majeure partie situés en bordure de la limite linguistique flamingo-wallone, ces traits phonétiques sont peut-être particuliers aux Flamands qui apprennent le français.

De toute façon, ce sont là des remarques intéressantes, qui, sans nier nécessairement la conclusion de Geddes sur l'origine du phénomène, engagent à faire des hypothèses, que des recherches ultérieures permettront de vérifier.

Le second trait phonétique que nous tenons à signaler est la prononciation *wé* (oué) dans les substantifs formés avec le suffixe *oir*, du latin *orium*.

⁵James Geddes, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁶Maurice Grevisse, *Le Bon Usage*, p. 53.

Cette prononciation n'était pas générale pour tous les mots de cette catégorie; nous l'avons relevée dans les mots suivants:

Battwé	pour	Battoir
Coulwé	"	Couloir
Episswé	"	Epissoir
Ourdiswé	"	Ourdissoir
Razwé	"	Rasoir
Salwé	"	Saloir

Dans les autres substantifs en *oir*, les mêmes informateurs prononçaient soit *wè* (oué) avec *r* sonore: *raccuwlèr* - *menwlèr* - *entonnwlèr* - *mâchwèr*; soit *wé* (oué) avec *r* sonore: *chatwér* - *roulwér* - *crachwér*.

Mais un de nos vieux informateurs nous a affirmée que, durant son adolescence, la prononciation en *wé* était beaucoup plus répandue qu'aujourd'hui. Il m'a fourni en guise d'exemples: *mirwé* - *muchwé* - *crachwé*, qui se prononçaient alors de cette façon.

D'ailleurs, Geddes avait relevé les mots, plus quelques autres: *accrochwé* - *arroswé* - *percwé* - *reposwé* - *tirwé*, avec la même prononciation à Carleton, en 1890.

Des trois prononciations notées à Bonaventure (*wé* - *wér* - *wèr*) pour les substantifs formés avec le suffixe *oir*, la première est certes la plus ancienne et la plus intéressante à étudier.

Cette étude doit être faite à deux points de vue: celui de la chute du *r* et celui du son qu'on a fait entendre à diverses époques sous la graphie *oi*.

"La chute du *r* final est générale au XV^{ème} siècle et sans doute auparavant", dit Dauzat. Mais si l'on en croit Thurot, "l'usage paraît avoir été partagé", sinon au XVI^{ème}, du moins au XVII^{ème} siècle, quant aux substantifs en *oir*. La chute du *r* final n'y était pas acceptée sans opposition; et si des grammairiens permettent de le supprimer dans certains mots, tels: *miroi* - *mouchoi* - *saloï* - *tiroï* - *sautoï* - *réfectoi* - *dortoi*, et maints autres, d'autres n'admettent pas cet amuïssement et s'y opposent fortement. Tant et si bien qu'à partir du milieu du XVIII^{ème} siècle, ces derniers ont gain de cause et réussissent à restaurer l'*r* final dans cette classe de mots.

L'amuïssement du *r* final est donc fort ancien dans la langue, et, à l'époque où les mots que nous avons relevés ont traversé au Canada, l'action régressive des grammairiens n'avait pu se faire sentir, donc elle n'avait pu s'exercer sur les classes populaires, et encore moins dans les provinces où l'on parlait français.

L'étude du son qu'a pu cacher la graphie *oi* est plus instructive encore pour nous aider à déterminer l'ancienneté de la prononciation en *wé*.

Le son orthographié *oi*, dans les substantifs en *oir*, du latin *orium*, a, dans la période ancienne du français, assoné avec des mots comme *flor*, *sol*. "Il ne s'est confondu avec la diphthongue *oi* que

⁷Albert Dauzat, *Histoire de la langue française*, p. 96.

vers le début du XIII^e. . .”⁸ “Au cours du [XIII^e siècle], dit Dauzat, oi [prononcé oy, comme dans l’anglais boy] passe à la diphtongue oé, et par glissement d’accent à voyelle wé, dont le premier élément tendra bientôt à s’éliminer.”⁹ Bourciez, pour la même époque, celle de l’ancien français—environ du XI^e au XIV^e siècle—ne signale pas un passage immédiat de oé à wé, mais de oé à oé, puis, vers la fin du moyen âge, de oé à wé “qui pendant plus de trois siècles devait rester assez solide.”¹⁰

En effet, durant les XVI^e, XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles, l’usage normal a été la prononciation wé.¹¹ Quant à la prononciation wa (oua), c’est une prononciation qu’on a constatée de bonne heure, parmi le menu peuple de Paris, et qui a fini par supplanter définitivement la prononciation wé, vers la fin du XVIII^e siècle. On sait que c’est aujourd’hui la prononciation normale du français dans les mots orthographiés oi.¹²

Ce bref historique nous laisse entrevoir l’ancienneté de la prononciation wé, malgré des divergences possibles entre les historiens de la phonétique du français, quant à certaines évolutions de cette voyelle. Elle remonterait au moyen âge, peut-être au XIII^e, probablement au XIV^e ou au XV^e siècle.

Les patois des provinces de France de langue d’oïl ont d’ailleurs conservé la prononciation wé dans certains substantifs en oir, à côté, évidemment, d’autres prononciations comme wér, wèr, wa, è, et aussi war.

A la carte 878 de l’Atlas linguistique de France de Gilliéron et Edmont, on trouve pour le mot *mouchoir* les terminaisons suivantes: *mouchwé* - *mouchwér* - *mouchwèr* - *mouchwa*. La terminaison qui l’emporte de beaucoup sur les autres est wé. A noter les terminaisons en wèr, assez fréquentes, et en wér, plus rares, que nous avons également relevées à Bonaventure. Quant à la terminaison wa, dont nous n’avons pu avoir de témoignage dans la paroisse susdite, elle est attestée dans la province de Québec, dans les mots: *salwa* - *lawwa* - *battwa*.

A la carte 1304, consacrée au mot *tiroir*, on note les mêmes terminaisons. Mais la forme *tirwé* est fortement concurrencée par les autres.

Pour *battoir*, à la carte 116, la forme *battwé* est de beaucoup la plus répandue.

Ces témoignages sont précieux, quand on sait que les patois sont ordinairement conservateurs et archaïsants, par suite de leur éloignement et de leur manque de contact avec le centre linguistique, où s’est produite et où se produit encore l’évolution de la langue française, en l’occurrence Paris. Ils le sont, de plus, comme des preuves incontestables des origines bien françaises de la façon, au Canada d’expression française, de prononcer la voyelle complexe oi.

⁸Edouard Bourciez, *Précis de phonétique française*, p. 106.

⁹Albert Dauzat, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

¹⁰Edouard Bourciez, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-76.

¹¹Charles Thurot, *De la prononciation française*, t. II, pp. 353-354.

¹²Edward Bourciez, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

Pour ne pas allonger indéfiniment cet article, voici brièvement quelques autres traits phonétiques relevés dans la même paroisse.

1. Permutation de *é* ou de *è* avec *a* dans:

Elèner	pour	Alèner
Plèner	"	Planer
Tèrir	"	Tarir
Pènèris	"	Panaris

Pour les mots qui viennent d'être cités, je n'ai relevé la permutation que dans la bouche d'un seul informateur.

Pour les suivants, chez deux informateurs au moins:

Mèrée	pour	Marée
S'élonger	"	S'allonger

Geddes a relevé: *tèrir* - *pènèris* - *égrandir*, à Carleton.

2. Permutation de *a* avec *é* ou *è* dans:

Trasser	pour	Tresser
Cramailère	"	Crémaillère

Maints cas de permutations identiques ou presque sont cités par Thurot.¹³ Il cite, entr'autres, *terir*¹⁴, *tracer* (*trasser*),¹⁵ et *cramailère*.¹⁶

3. Quelques cas de métathèses:¹⁷

Kerton	pour	Creton
Gerlot	"	Grelot
Gernier	"	Grenier
Contervent	"	Contrevent
Ferdir	"	Frédir
Mékerdi	"	Mercredi
On perhait	"	On prenait
Quatertemps	"	Quatre-temps

4. Quelques cas où la consonne *v* est prononcée *we* devant *oi*, prononcé *wé* ou *wè*:

Awène	pour	Avoine
Wèle	"	Voile
Wésin	"	Voisin
Wéture	"	Voiture

Il semble qu'on ait là un cas d'assimilation régressive de la labiodentale sonore *v* par la bilabiale *we*.

5. Permutation de *o* ouvert ou fermé avec *ou*:

Soubriquet	pour	Sobriquet
Coulombe	"	Colombe
Coulorer	"	Colorer
Forbir	"	Fourbir
Gôlot	"	Goulot

¹³Charles Thurot, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-32.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹⁷Cas identiques signalés par Thurot, *op. cit.*, t. II, pp. 286-289, et par Geddes, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-93.

Thurot dit "qu'au 16e siècle, l'usage paraît avoir été très partagé entre o et ou",¹⁸ et il cite comme exemples les mêmes cas que ci-haut ou des cas analogues.

Ce ne sont là que quelques-uns des traits phonétiques que nous avons relevés à Bonaventure. Mais il nous semble qu'ils suffisent à montrer l'intérêt que présente l'étude de la phonétique de cette paroisse gaspésienne. Elle est nettement archaïsante par rapport à l'évolution phonétique du français commun, et, par son retard, s'affirme un témoin vivant de quelques-uns des stades par où est passée cette évolution.

¹⁸Charles Thurot, op. cit., p. 240.

SPEECH DIFFERENCES ALONG THE ONTARIO-UNITED STATES BORDER

by

Walter S. Avis, R.M.C., Kingston

II. GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX

In the first article of this series I pointed out the great similarity between the speech habits of Ontarians and those of their American neighbours across the line: both speak a variety of North American English.¹ This state of affairs should not be surprising in view of the early settlement history of the borderlands and of subsequent cultural and social contact along the border.

There are, nevertheless, many linguistic features not shared by speakers of English on both sides of the border. In terms of vocabulary I have already illustrated a number of such differences, indicating that, in the main, they probably result from the generalization in Ontario of words current in British English—the speech of thousands of immigrants who have come to Canada during the past century or so.

As with vocabulary, so with other departments of speech—grammar, syntax, and pronunciation. Leaving pronunciation for my next article, I shall here deal with some miscellaneous examples loosely classed as grammar and syntax. Differences of this kind are probably fewer among educated people and undeniably harder to determine by the questionnaire method. In matters of grammar especially, cleavages are more commonly social than regional, though, as Professor Atwood has shown, verb forms do have striking regional distributions in the United States.²

In my pilot survey of Ontario speech I included in my questionnaire several verb forms which might be expected to reveal divided usage even among college people, for example, the preterite *dove*, a long-established and much-maligned “Americanism” which is predominant at all levels of society in the Northern speech area. According to the responses of my informants, *dove* is more commonly heard than *dived* in Ontario, even at the college level; of 150 persons answering the question, 88 used *dove*, 57 *dived*, and five either one. On the other hand, *loan* (verb), another “Americanism”, was less popular than *lend*, the British preference; of 85 informants questioned, 58 used *lend*, 24 *loan*, and three either one.

Not all British forms fare so well in Ontario. The contraction *shan't*, a commonplace in British speech, was used by only 22 of 145 informants, the rest preferring *won't* in the frame “I be there tonight”. As a matter of interest, I might point out that almost

¹“Speech Differences, etc., I. Vocabulary”, JCLA, I (Oct., 1954), 13-8.

²E. Bagby Atwood, *A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor, 1953). Raven I. McDavid, Jr., has shown that usage with prepositions also varies from region to region, in “The Habitat of Prepositions”, a paper read to the American Dialect Society in New York, Dec. 28, 1954. With his permission, I have drawn freely from this study.

half of the women questioned used *shan't*—13 of the 22 showed a preference for the British form, which enjoys little currency south of the border. *Shall not* was preferred by six informants. The British past participle *got* fares a little better, perhaps because generations of schoolmarm have given it their unqualified support. The hoary old *gotten*, which has flourished lustily in America since colonial days, has latterly fallen into disrepute in the Old Country. In Ontario, in spite of the campaign waged against it, the "American" form is by no means extinct. Given the frame "He has (*got* or *gotten*) two raises this year", 68 of 135 informants chose *got*, 60 *gotten*, and three either; the remaining four eschewed both, preferring *had*, an interesting commentary on the status of *got* in some circles. Curiously enough, none of those preferring the British *got* took exception to the Americanism *raises*, the equivalent of which in British English is *ises*.

In the North American speech area the usual form of the past participle of *drink* is *drank* rather than *drunk*, which is standard in British English and indeed usual in the Southern speech area of the United States.³ Among cultured informants in the Northern area—especially in New England, the very citadel of prestige speech—the incidence of *drank* as past participle is high enough to justify the label "standard"⁴. In Ontario, according to my survey, the participial form of *drank* is not unusual among the educated. Given the frame "he has (*drank* or *drunk*) five glasses of beer already", 51 of 85 informants used *drunk*, 29 *drank*, one either, and four were uncertain. Here, as elsewhere, I suspect that the number using both forms at times is much greater than the choices indicate.

An interesting difference between American and Canadian usage may be observed in the sentence "I am going to *bath* the baby." In Michigan, my wife's neighbours were always taken aback when she used this Canadianism (by way of British usage). They invariably used *bathe* in this context. Like my wife, I bath babies, though I would bathe an eye or a wound. Being interested in such differences in speech, I included in my questionnaire a sentence frame calling for a choice between *bath* and *bathe* the baby. Of 90 respondents, 55 said they would *bath* the baby, 34 would *bathe* it, and one would use either term. The number of *bathe* responses, I must confess, surprised me. A closer look at the evidence showed that, in general, *bath* was the preferred term among older informants, *bathe* among the younger, unmarried informants. This division suggests either that the American usage is supplanting the older British usage or that the context had little significance for the younger, unmarried informants. One might wonder if similar results would have been obtained had the frame sentence been "John can't come to the

³Atwood, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

⁴See Walter S. Avis, "The Past Participle 'Drank': Standard American Usage", *American Speech*, XXVII (May, 1953), 106-11. In this article I included the Linguistic Atlas data for Ontario; of five cultured informants, four used *drunk*, and one used either. The present study suggests that Ontarians follow northern American practice more closely than seemed probable from earlier scant evidence. Available evidence indicates that *drank* as participle is commonplace as a vulgar verb form in Ontario.

phone; he's (*bathing* or *batheing*).” Probably many would prefer *having a bath*—in both countries.

Another personal experience in Michigan gave point to a striking syntactical difference in border speech—one which stems from British influence on Canadian speech habits. Shortly after my arrival in Ann Arbor, I entered a store and asked, “Have you any marmalade?” (I might have said “Have you got any marmalade?”). I was rather surprised to be answered, “No, we don’t.” Quite apart from the fact that marmalade is less popular in Michigan than in Ontario (a possible cause of surprise to a Torontonians), the syntax of the reply was momentarily confusing. Naturally enough, I expected “No, we haven’t” as a negative response to my question. The clerk, however, was responding to a syntactical form he was accustomed to hearing, namely, “Do you have any marmalade?”

I soon learned that *do you have* was the American way of asking for things and during my stay in the States I adopted it. In this case the borrowing came into my speech almost without effort, simply because the *do-you* construction is the established and productive pattern for phrasing questions in Modern English: *do you smoke a pipe?*, *do you like bourbon?* and so on. It is not surprising, then, that Canadian living south of the border unconsciously adopt the *do-you-have* construction, even though they might not adopt Americanisms to any great degree. But, one might ask, what happens to this snugly fitting adjustment when Canadians return home? In my experience, the adopted form persists, although the *have-you* (*-got*) form re-asserts itself under pressure of general usage in Ontario.

According to my survey, *do you have* has surprisingly little currency in Ontario; of 85 persons questioned, only nine responded with the American form and three would use either. It is significant that several of the 12 persons who use the form have lived in the States at one time or another.

The use of the preposition *to* in the expression *a quarter to eleven* is almost general in Ontario. Immediately south of the border, however, *of* is frequently heard in this context, though *to* is also used. The apparent absence of *of* in Ontario is curious, since this preposition is well established alongside *to* in New England and all the Yankee settlement areas. Perhaps a larger sampling of rustic usage, say, in the St. Lawrence Valley, would bring to light some instances of this Yankee expression; in fact, I have met at least one speaker in eastern Ontario who uses it.⁵ In answering my questionnaire, 132 of 135 informants used *to*, one used *till* (near Windsor) and two *before*. The overwhelming predominance of *to* may be due in part to British influence, since the Linguistic Atlas records for Southern England indicate that this is the preposition in general use there.

⁵Professor Henry Alexander's Maritime field records (Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada) show that *of* is occasionally heard in New Brunswick and, rarely, in Nova Scotia. *Till*, a Scots variant, seems to have some currency among older informants on Cape Breton Island.

Another expression which has some striking variants depending on the choice of preposition is *sick at the stomach*. In the Northern speech area of the United States the usual equivalent is *sick to the stomach*; in the Midland and Southern areas, *at* is the usual preposition, though *in* and *on* occur in several regions settled by German immigrants, for example, in eastern Pennsylvania. In New England (except in the southwest, where *at* has some currency) and most of the Yankee settlement areas, *to* enjoys a virtual monopoly. In north-west New York State, however, *sick at the stomach* is unusually common. Since this enclave is isolated by *to*-speakers from the Midland and from Metropolitan New York, where *at* is also found, the presence of the *at* form is a curious phenomenon. Some time ago, the possible influence of Canadian and Midland usage (perhaps by way of Canada) on the speech of the Buffalo area was pointed out by Professor McDavid;⁶ it is not unlikely that this syntactical item belongs with the lexical forms (*coal oil*, *dew worm*, etc.) suggesting Canadian influence in this area. It should be added that the *at* construction occurs fairly often in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, another area having close historical ties with Ontario.

The foregoing suggestion of Canadian trans-border influence with regard to *sick at the stomach* is supported by the high incidence of the *at* construction in Western Ontario, where it appears to be far more common than *to*. In fact, Midland influence through Pennsylvania Loyalist settlers may account for the predominance of *at* west of Toronto. Moreover, *sick in the stomach*, a Penn "Dutch" expression, is frequently heard in the German settlements of Western Ontario. Both *at* and *in* are commonplaces in those parts of the Midland speech area which contributed Loyalists to the settlement of this part of Ontario.

In Ontario as a whole a striking regional difference exists in the distribution of *sick at the stomach* and *sick to the stomach*. West of Toronto, *at* appears to be the more common usage; from Toronto eastward, *to* is usual. This situation points up the intimate historical connection between the Lake Ontario - St. Lawrence area and the eastern New York - New England area. The distribution pattern of *sick at the stomach* and *sick to the stomach* throughout Ontario seems to reflect the difference in settlement history that exists between western and eastern Ontario.

My findings for this expression are as follows: of 105 informants, 55 used *to* (mostly from Toronto eastward), 40 used *at* (mostly west of Toronto), one used either *at* or *to*, seven used *in* (Western Ontario), one used *of*, and one avoided the term as "crude". Evidence for British usage is inconclusive; the Atlas records suggest that the expression is not in general use. As a matter of interest I might add that all of five bilingual French-Canadians questioned used *sick in the stomach*, though their replies are not included in the above-mentioned figures.

⁶Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "Midland and Canadian Words in Upstate New York", *American Speech*, XXVI (Dec., 1951), 248-56. See also my article referred to in f.n. 1 above.

Some locations which are usual in British usage are virtually unknown in Ontario—among native-born Canadians at least. We live *on* a street and get *on* a train, whereas the British live *in* the first and get *on* the second. On my early questionnaire I gave my informants a choice between *in* and *on* in such constructions. When I found that the responses were unanimous for *on*, I dropped the question as unrewarding.

Professor McDavid's studies of syntactical variations involving prepositions deal with a number of expressions for which I have no Canadian evidence.⁷ Such items as "he died (*of, with, from, or for*) pneumonia"; "he was named (*after, for, or from*) his uncle"; "he came over (*to, for, to, or for*) tell it" might reveal interesting contrasts. The expression "I want off", with ellipsis of the infinitive *to get*, is native to my Toronto speech, and may be quite common in Ontario. Yet McDavid finds that it is a Midland usage having little or no currency in the Northern area adjacent to Ontario.

In connection with the comparison of the results from my survey in Ontario with the Linguistic Atlas findings for the Northern and Midland speech areas, I must call attention to one problem. The proportion of educated informants in the former is greater than in the latter. In dealing with most of the lexical items on my questionnaire I found that this discrepancy had little significance; with grammatical and syntactical items the comparisons must be viewed with caution. For example, McDavid cites the use of *to* in "he lives over *to* the Browns'" as "overwhelmingly predominant in the North. . . ." In a similar construction on my questionnaire, 81 of 85 informants responded with *at*, apparently indicating that this preposition is overwhelmingly predominant in Ontario; only two used *to* and two more used either. There is every possibility that a larger sample of rural informants might have increased the representation of *to*.

Another item on my questionnaire brings the problem well into the foreground. Given the sentence frame "the truck is (*behind, back of, or in back of*) the barn", the informants were asked to mark the prepositional construction they would use. Of 85 persons responding, 74 used *behind*, seven *back of*, and four *in back of*. Only two (one a Ph.D. from Chatham) of those using *in back of* were college people; the other nine using (*in*) *back of* had not gone beyond high school, and most of them were of rural background. Thus, among the few non-college people concerned in this survey, a remarkably high proportion used the dialectical variants. The Atlas records, according to McDavid's analysis, show that the (*in*) *back of* prepositional unit is commonly heard throughout the Northern speech area (and elsewhere in the States). Although my survey shows that it is relatively uncommon in Ontario speech, it seems probable that a state of vulgate speech habits would show the expression to be a commonplace.

⁷See f.n. 2 above.

Admittedly, the few grammatical and syntactical illustrations I have presented do not reveal many marked or consistent differences between the speech habits of Americans and Canadians along the Ontario borders; but they do suggest that differences do exist. Undoubtedly, a closer and more extensive survey of language patterns would bring other significant differences—and similarities—into focus.

TABULAR SUMMARY

Total Informants (a)	A British	B Northern American	Proportion using term A	Term A only	Term B only	Either
85	lend	/ loan	71.7	68.2	28.3	3.5
85	has drunk	/ has drank	65.9	60	341.	5.9
90	bath (v)	/ bath	62.3	61.1	377.	1.2
135	has got	/ has gotten	52.5	50.3	44.5	2.2 ¹
150	he dived	/ he dove	41.3	38	58.7	3.3
145	I shan't	/ I won't	15.2	15.2	80.7	0 ²
(b)						
50	live in a street	/ on	0	100	0	0
135	quarter to	/ others ³	97.8	97.8	2.2	0
85	over at Brown's	/ to	97.6	95.2	2.4	2.4
85	have you (got)	/ do you have	89.4	86.1	10.6	3.3
85	behind	/ (in) back of ⁴	87	87	13	0
105	sick at the stomach	/ to	39.9	39	52.3	.9

NOTES

¹Had was preferred by the other 30%.

²Shall not was preferred by the other 4.1%.

³The other prepositions include: before 1.5%, till 7%, of 0%.

⁴In back of was used by only 4.7%.

⁵The remaining 7.8% responded as follows: "sick in the stomach" 6%, "sick of the stomach" 0.9%; one speaker (0.9%) avoided the expression as "crude".

LINGUISTICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTREAL

by

J. P. Vinay, Director, Section de Linguistique

The Chair of Experimental Phonetics in the Faculty of Arts of the University of Montréal was founded in 1946. By 1949 it was becoming the nucleus of an autonomous *Section* within the Faculty and was extending its radius of action by the inauguration of courses in general and applied linguistics, in philology (principally in the Romance and Germanic fields), and in translation and interpretation.

The *Section de Linguistique* and its functions are unique in Canada. The independence of the *Section* enables it to remain unattached to any Department in the University and, hence, to be free from an exclusive concern with one particular type of language. The theses presented by our students for the degree of M.A. or of Ph.D. range from Baltic to American Indian language studies. They include also, as is to be expected, subjects from more classical fields: French, English, Spanish, etc.

This independence determines also the kind of students who come to the *Section*. First of all, there is a considerable number of students, registered in other Departments, who are preparing for a diploma, a *licence*, an M.A. or a Ph.D. in classical, modern, and Slavic languages, etc. These students come to the *Section de Linguistique* for general training in linguistic analysis and description and they register in courses of the "classical" type such as L.282, *An Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*; L.210, *An Introduction to English Linguistics*; L.275, *French Philology*.

Other students come to us to learn modern languages and to work in the Listening Laboratory with records, tapes, cymographs, etc. We are able to help them at various levels, especially in descriptive phonetics (cf. L.270, *Phonetics of Modern French*), in grammar (L.271, *French Lexicology*), A.200, *Principles of Semantics*), and in methodology. We also teach introductory courses for foreigners (French and English); and, naturally, in the summer the entire *Section* opens for *Summer School*, which extends from the end of June until the middle of August.

In addition to those mentioned above, there is a certain number of students, generally at research level, who wish to specialize in a particular branch of linguistics. For these people, who are never very many—their number varies from one to ten, according to the year—we offer a very complete training over a period of three years. This includes specialized subjects such as are taught in Courses L.290, *Seminar in General Linguistics*; L.293, *Seminar in Germanic Linguistics*, and in the instrumental phonetics laboratory (L.218, *Experimental Phonetics*). The titles of theses presented by these students can best explain their principal interests in the course of

their studies. Several times the Humanities Research Council of Canada has very kindly helped students with scholarships intended to facilitate their research or to allow them to spend a year at a foreign university in order to complete their training.

Because of the bilingual nature of Montréal and its environs, the problem of training translators and interpreters presented itself very early in the University. In 1950 the *Section* was asked to establish a programme of studies leading to the degree of M.A. *en traduction*, the only one of its kind in Canada. To obtain the M.A. *Trad.*, students who have a B.A. follow a special course of training which includes, in particular, techniques of simultaneous interpretation and a parallel study of English and French, with a third language. The thesis that is required for the completion of these studies must deal with some point of comparative stylistics or with some problem in the science of "communications". At the present time more than twelve students are completing their theses and are entering as translators either departments of the Federal Government or radio, press, television and so on.

In order to make known these various activities, some of which are quite new in Canada, the *Section* published in 1953 an *Inventory*¹ where the reader will find details of the work undertaken, the theses presented, and various publications of the teaching staff, as well as acknowledgements of books and periodicals received by the *Section*. Other publications will follow shortly: in particular, a study by M. R. Charbonneau of the *Palatalization of t/d in French-Canadian*; a bibliographical study in linguistics; a grammatical study by M. R. Bergeron. The *Section* will announce these works as they appear and will send copies on request, hoping to receive in exchange publications in linguistics from other universities.

[Translation by C. H. Moore, Alberta.]

¹Vinay, J. P. Bilan de cinq années, Université de Montréal, 1953. Reviewed in the *Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, Vol. 1, No. 1, October, 1954.

LA SOCIÉTÉ DU PARLER FRANÇAIS AU CANADA

par

Gaston Dulong, Université Laval

Fondée à Québec en 1902, la Société du Parler français au Canada est sûrement la doyenne des sociétés de linguistique au Canada. Seule, croyons-nous, The American Dialect Society, est de fondation antérieure en Amérique du Nord, cette dernière ayant vu le jour en janvier 1889. La fondation de la Société du Parler français fut l'oeuvre de l'abbé Lortie et surtout d'Adjutor Rivard qui demeure le pionnier des études de linguistique française au Canada.

Le but de la Société fut l'étude de la langue parlée: phonétique, lexicale, morphologie, syntaxe. Pour mener à bien cette étude, on organisa une vaste enquête par correspondance qui devait durer un quart de siècle. Les résultats de cette enquête étaient ensuite étudiés en séances d'études, par un groupe de chercheurs, mis sur fiches et versés dans un immense fichier d'où sortit plus tard le *Glossaire du Parler français au Canada*.

Pour maintenir le contact entre les différents membres correspondants de la Société, dès 1902, on fonda le *Bulletin du Parler français au Canada* qui parut jusqu'en 1918. De 1918 à 1946 le *Canada français* devint la revue et de l'Université Laval et de la Société du Parler français continuée depuis par le *Revue de l'Université Laval*.

C'est en 1930 que parut le *Glossaire du Parler français au Canada*.¹ Les deux principaux compilateurs de cette oeuvre considérable, Adjutor Rivard et Louis-Philippe Geoffrion, avertissent la lecteur dans la préface que ce glossaire est celui du "français écrit ou parlé dans la province de Québec". Et plus loin dans la même préface:

"Nous n'entendons pas porter un jugement sur chacun des mots inscrits au Glossaire; nous laissons ce soin au lecteur, après lui avoir fourni les éléments qui permettront à son bon goût de se prononcer. En feuilletant ce volume, les uns chercheront à s'assurer de la légitimité d'un archaïsme ou de quelque produit nouveau; d'autres se plairont plutôt à y relever la trace des dialectes d'oïl; celui-ci s'en servira pour corriger son langage, celui-là, pour l'enrichir; plusieurs, peut-être, se contenteront du plaisir qu'on éprouve à écouter les sons savoureux d'un parler du terroir français. . . . Nous ne prétendons dicter à personne le meilleur usage à faire de notre glossaire."

Chaque fois que la chose a été possible, les auteurs du glossaire ont rattaché les mots ou les formes en usage dans le parler franco-canadien aux patois des provinces françaises d'où les Canadiens-français étaient originaires. Par la quantité des matériaux lexicologiques, phonétiques, morphologiques et même syntaxiques qu'il renferme, par la méthode scientifique qui a présidé à la composition

¹Glossaire du Parler français au Canada, Québec, 1930, XIX—710 pp.

de chaque article, ce glossaire représente un progrès considérable sur tout ce qui avait été fait antérieurement sur la langue franco-canadienne, et il restera encore longtemps le glossaire classique par excellence.

Ce glossaire, en dépit de ses qualités évidentes, comporte cependant des lacunes considérables. Une enquête par correspondance n'a de valeur que dans la mesure où les matériaux qu'elle fournit sont ensuite vérifiés sur place par un enquêteur expérimenté. Or on ne fit aucune enquête de contrôle. C'est dire que les notations phonétiques laissent à désirer et que beaucoup de mots pourtant très répandus n'ont jamais été recueillis. Cela est d'autant plus regrettable que plusieurs mots sont en train de disparaître parce que les choses ou les méthodes de travail évoluent très rapidement dans notre siècle. De plus le glossaire ne comporte aucune localisation. Le lecteur non prévenu pourrait croire que *banneau* (tombeureau) *fani* (fenil) *tasserie* (partie de la grange où l'on tasse le foin . . .) *arse* (espace), sont employés dans toute la province de Québec, ce qui serait une erreur. Pourtant les fiches de la société comportaient des localisations par comtés, vagues sans doute, mais pourtant très précieuses. Aucun dessin n'illustre des objets difficiles à imaginer si on ne les connaît déjà. Enfin, on ne fit aucun usage de l'Atlas linguistique de la France que connaissaient pourtant les auteurs du glossaire.

"Le lexique d'une langue vivante n'est jamais complètement établi: quand on l'a fini, c'est déjà l'heure de le recommencer" lit-on encore dans la préface du glossaire. Cette vérité à laquelle souscrivent volontiers tous les linguistes semble avoir été oubliée par la Société du Parler français qui vécut presque sur ses lauriers de 1930 à 1949. Il fallut attendre une nouvelle relève formée auprès des linguistes français actuels pour que la Société reprît une vie active.

En 1952, une belle occasion s'offrit de grouper des linguistes en célébrant les noces d'or de la Société du Parler français. Le congrès qu'elle organisa et au cours duquel une douzaine de communications originales furent présentées permit de faire le point des études sur le parler français au Canada. Ces travaux sont actuellement sous presse.

Quelques années auparavant, la création à Laval d'un certificat de linguistique et de philologie devait donner un regain de vie à la Société en lui permettant de se recruter des membres parmi les étudiants à ce certificat. A partir de ce moment, la bibliothèque très riche de la Société devenait une sorte de laboratoire pour ces étudiants. Cette bibliothèque, commencée dès 1902, comprend actuellement les fonds Rivard et Geoffrion et compte environ douze cents volumes de linguistique classifiés. Elle renferme une très précieuse collection de glossaires français de toutes les provinces d'où sont originaires les Canadiens-français: Picardie, Normandie, Perche, Bretagne, Poitou, Aunis, Saintonge, Orléanais, Centre de la France; les dictionnaires Godefroy, Cotgrave, Huguet, Ménage,

Richelet, Furetière, Trévoux, plusieurs éditions du Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, Bescherelle, Littré, Larousse . . . etc; les dictionnaires techniques Roret; plusieurs études linguistiques françaises, belges ou suisses, l'Atlas linguistique de la France, plusieurs dictionnaires étymologiques dont le FEW² de Walther von Wartburg en cours de publication. On pourrait ajouter à cela la série complète des Dialect Notes publiée par l'American Dialect Society ainsi que la série qui la continue, beaucoup de dictionnaires techniques bilingues enfin à peu près tout ce qui a été publié sur la langue franco-canadienne ou sur l'acadien.

La Société du Parler français est actuellement à constituer un immense fichier dans lequel sont d'abord incorporés tout les anciens glossaires canadiens, en commençant par celui du Père Potier³ venu au Canada à la fin du régime français et qui nous a laissé un manuscrit très précieux sur la langue des Canadiens. Dans son glossaire figurent déjà *cakeu*, *carriole*, *poudrer*, *poudrerie* . . . etc. La mise sur fiches de ces glossaires est déjà très avancée et se poursuit activement. Elle permet de voir depuis quand un mot est employé dans la langue et sera très précieuse pour différentes études particulières, par exemple pour celle de l'anglicisme dans la langue franco-canadienne. Ce fichier comprendra aussi le dépouillement déjà commencé d'auteurs anciens comme Nicolas Denys,⁴ Franquet⁵ ainsi que des auteurs canadiens comme J.-C. Taché, Philippe-Aubert de Gaspé. Ce travail de dépouillement devra s'étendre aux procès-verbaux des procès, aux minutes notariales, de même qu'aux nombreux enregistrements sonores que possèdent les Archives de Folklore de l'Université Laval. Ces enregistrements sonores sont d'autant plus précieux que les mots ou les tournures sont dans un contexte, qu'ils sont datés, localisés.

Mais c'est surtout par des enquêtes sur le terrain que la Société compte enrichir son fichier et avoir de la langue canadienne une image précise. Ces enquêtes sont déjà commencées. Elles révèlent l'existence de beaucoup de mots qui n'ont jamais été relevés. Elles permettent de localiser des mots déjà connus ou encore de fixer phonétiquement et chronologiquement des manifestations linguistiques.

La Société cherche à former des enquêteurs et des chercheurs parmi ses membres actifs. Tous les quinze jours a lieu une séance d'étude. Cette séance d'étude débute toujours par des exercices de notation phonétique: mots isolés, groupes de mots, phrases complètes. Ces exercices ont le très grand avantage d'attirer l'attention sur des points de phonétique qui jusqu'alors passaient inaperçus et d'élargir chez les futurs enquêteurs la gamme de sons perceptibles.

²FEW: *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* par Walther von Wartburg publié en fascicules depuis 1922. L'auteur en est à la lettre N.

³Le Père Potier, s.j., arriva à Québec en 1743, séjourna à Lorette et au Détroit où il mourut en 1781. Son manuscrit intitulé *Façons de parler proverbiales, triviales, figurées*, etc. des Canadiens au XVIII^e siècle été publié pour la première fois dans le *Bulletin du Parler français au Canada*, Volumes III et IV, 1905-1906.

⁴Nicolas Denys, *Description géographique et historique des costes de l'Amérique Septentrionale*. Avec l'histoire naturelle du pays, Paris, 2 vol. 1672.

⁵Franquet, *Voyages et mémoires sur le Canada*, Manuscrit écrit en 1752 et publié à Québec en 1889, 214 pp.

Chacun des membres doit apporter à chaque réunion deux mots ou expressions sur lesquels il a travaillé au cours des deux semaines précédentes. Ce travail permet au jeune chercheur de se familiariser avec les instruments de travail indispensables au dialectologue: glossaires, dictionnaires d'ancien français, dictionnaires étymologiques, l'Atlas linguistique de la France, le FEW de v. Wartburg. Ce travail de laboratoire est discuté par les membres présents, mis au point et finalement écrit sur fiche et versé au fichier général. Inutile je crois d'insister sur l'importance des services que peut rendre la consultation du FEW, dictionnaire étymologique dont aucune langue ne possède l'équivalent. Les références à l'Atlas linguistique de la France sont aussi indispensables car il est impossible de comprendre l'extension géographique de mots comme *couier*, *mouiller*, *mouches à miel*, *patates*, *tirer* dans la langue franco-canadienne si on n'en connaît déjà l'extension dans les patois en France.

Toutes les fiches comportent les renseignements suivants: le mot, nature du mot, notation phonétique, définition complète suivie d'un ou de plusieurs exemples, dessin, croquis ou photographie de la chose s'il y a lieu avec dimensions réelles, synonymes ou doublets populaires, étymologie, référence à l'ALF⁶ s'il y a lieu, localisation précise, date, nom de l'informateur, son âge, signature du collaborateur.

La Société possède actuellement une méthode de travail, qui sans être parfaite, répond aux exigences scientifiques de tout travail dialectologique sérieux; de plus en plus le recrutement de ses membres est assuré grâce au nombre de plus en plus grand des étudiants du certificat de linguistique et de philologie. Ajoutons que déjà elle peut compter sur le travail et la collaboration d'anciens membres formés par elle et dispersés dans les différentes régions francophones.

Son travail est aussi largement compris et épaulé par les folkloristes, les géographes et les historiens avec qui elle entend travailler en étroite collaboration et dont plusieurs assistent régulièrement à ses séances d'étude.

⁶ALF: Atlas linguistique de la France par Gilliéron et Edmont, Paris, 1902-1910.

CANADIAN ENGLISH AND CANADIAN CULTURE IN ALBERTA

by

M. H. Scargill, University of Alberta

What is a Canadian? Have we who call ourselves Canadians¹ a distinctive culture, a distinctive way of life and thought? Or are we "American" or "British"? Or are we perhaps in the unhappy position of being nothing but reflections of two great, yet different, nations? These questions are exercising the minds of a great many people today, and not just within our own borders. To be sure, the historian and the geographer have their answers: the economist has his. And the ethnologist has yet another. But none of them are quite satisfactory. Perhaps the best answer will soon be provided by another scholar—the linguist. And his will embrace those of other scholars and be better than theirs because it will be based on better evidence.

The value of a study of language as an index of culture is already well known, although little use of it has been made in Canada. Loan-words have been well called the "milestones of civilization" that date for us the nature and extent of the cultural influence of one nation on another. It is easy to see from a survey of the vocabulary of the English language the debts that English culture owes to many and different nations. We can read the history of the English people in the English language.

And borrowed words are not the only linguistic evidence for the nature of the relationships between one nation and another. Borrowings of other habits of speech—of pronunciation, of spelling, of grammatical devices—can tell us even more. When the English borrowed *prison* from their Norman masters, they borrowed as conquered from the conqueror. But earlier, when the English borrowed from those Scandinavians who had invaded their land such words as the pronouns *they*, *them*, *their* and the neuter ending *t* in such a word as *athwart*, the fusion between them must have been so complete that they were one people, drawing freely on the combined resources of their related languages.

When a man's vocabulary is filled with words borrowed from another nation, when his pronunciation and his habits of sentence structure are also strongly affected by borrowings, then his whole life must be deeply affected by that nation. He must be beginning to think in the way that nation thinks, for language is moulded by thought and, in turn, it moulds thought. The "mute, inglorious Milton" of Gray's *Elegy* was mute because he had no language. And he had no language because those countrymen with whose tongue he spoke had never felt the need to develop a speech fine enough to express fine ideas. Language is ideas given voice; and ideas are

¹Unless otherwise stated, Canadian in this article, because of the nature of the linguistic evidence, refers only to the English-speaking Canadian who is not bilingual.

the man. But if the language is not there, thoughts must remain, for most of us, unexpressed.

Here in Canada, among English-speaking and native-born Canadians, the study of language might prove the surest guide to the way in which we are developing. The fact that a Canadian drives a car made in Detroit does not make him think like an American. The fact that he subscribes to the *Times* does not make him think like an Englishman. But if our native-born Canadian speaks like an American, then his thoughts are probably being shaped like an American's thoughts. If he chooses to speak like an Englishman, then he is more English than he knows. But if our English-speaking and native-born Canadian prefers to develop his own habits of speech, then this must show that he is a man with ideas of his own to express—ideas that cannot be expressed in either British-English or American-English, because they are neither British nor American ideas. Where there is a language, there must be a nation to have made it what it is.

For the linguist to give answers that will help to define the meaning of *Canadian* he must have far more material than is now available to him. He must have a complete survey of the habits of speech of English-speaking Canadians across the country. He must have evidence of the ways in which their speech has changed and is still changing. He must note the variations from region to region and explain them. He must watch the habits of speech developed by new Canadians. But we have few scholars who can do these things competently for English-speaking Canadians. Our French-Canadian colleagues have a culture and a language of their own, and they study them. Our many Slavic communities are advanced in the study of their own language in Canada. It is the English-speaking Canadians who lag behind, who do not consider their language worthy of study, who do not seem to know or care if they have a culture and a language to give expression to it. Let us hope that this sad state of affairs will soon be remedied.

In order to make something of a beginning of a wider study of the habits of speech of English-speaking Canadians, a number of members of the Canadian Linguistic Association are investigating the speech of people in various areas. I myself have been investigating the pronunciation of cultured Canadians born and educated in Alberta. And it is to this investigation and the light it is beginning to throw on Canada in general that I shall turn now.

I began my investigation with the assumption, based on our province's history, that Canadians born and educated in Alberta must have found themselves faced with a choice between two types of pronunciation: American or British, or close approximations to these. I did not forget that they might have rejected these two and developed a distinctive pronunciation of their own.

In order to get a group of comparable informants, I limited my investigation to six hundred Albertans, of the same age and education (up to and a little beyond the last grade of high school). I

rejected for this survey informants who, although they were born here like the others, came from homes where another language was spoken in addition to English. I tried to space my informants regionally, dividing Alberta into four sections: North West, South West, North East, and South East, with Red Deer as a sort of central point. My survey is thus confined to cultured informants, of the same approximate age and background, spaced regionally.²

In testing pronunciation, about twenty key words were used, including eleven where there is a definite American pronunciation in contrast with a definite British pronunciation: e.g., *schedule*, *clerk*, *tomato*, and so on.³ On the advice of friends who are familiar with statistics, I decided that an American pronunciation of eight or more of the eleven words could be said to indicate a "predominantly American pronunciation" for the group of eleven. A British pronunciation of eight or more of the eleven words would indicate a "predominantly British pronunciation". A pronunciation which has no predominance is called "free". An informant who used both British and American pronunciations of the same word or who pronounced fewer than eight of the eleven in a definite way is described as having freedom of choice, a "free" pronunciation.⁴

The results of the investigation have proved remarkably interesting. Although they are valid only for the words and informants specified, they do seem to point to what might eventually be a distinctive pattern in Albertan speech.

Of the whole six hundred informants in this survey, 66.17% have a pronunciation which is predominantly American. Only 0.50% have a predominantly British pronunciation. The remaining 33.33%

²I should say here that I intended to let varieties of pronunciation finally form my regions for me. But in the end I found nothing to be gained by that.

³All the informants were questioned by Miss Claire Helman, who then gave her findings to me. The University of Alberta gave financial assistance to the project.

⁴Table of Test Words, showing Accepted American and British Pronunciations. (Evidence for the pronunciations is drawn mainly from Daniel Jones, *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*, and J. S. Kenyon and T. S. Knott, *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*.)

	American	British
vase.....	ves	vaz, vɔz
leisure.....	liʒə	leɪʒə
been (stressed).....	bɪn	bin
tomato.....	təmeto	təmato
schedule.....	skedʒul	fɛdʒul
clerk.....	klə:k	klak
either.....	iðə	aɪðə
lieutenant (army).....	lutənənt	leftənənt
half.....	hæf, haf	haf
recede (go back).....	risid	risid

The pronunciation of news as /nuz/, although not general in America, is certainly not British. When this pronunciation occurred (in 41.17% of the 600), it was allowed to count towards American predominance.

show a "free" pronunciation, using British and American pronunciations quite freely with no particular predominance.

The part of the province south of Red Deer, naturally enough, shows the greatest American predominance. In the South East 66.67% are entirely or predominantly American in pronunciation. In the South West the percentage showing American predominance is 75.32. The South West has such centres as Lethbridge, Raymond, and Cardston, which have been greatly influenced by our American neighbours. Calgary, not so far south, shows only 48.08% American predominance compared with more than 84% in Raymond and Cardston.

North of Red Deer the figures are somewhat different. In the North East 60.95% showed American predominance. In the North West only 49.27% favoured a predominantly American pronunciation, with 1.45% predominantly British, and the rest being free. The Peace River area shows the smallest American influence with 39.29% being predominantly American. Just 3.57% of the informants here are predominantly British (actually the largest group in the survey); the rest are free. Edmonton, also in the North West, shows 53.66% American predominance, with 1.24% British and 45.10% free.

Red Deer shows a neat 50% American predominance and a 50% free pronunciation.

The interpretation of the data given above is not difficult. The pronunciation of cultured and native Albertans is certainly not predominantly British. Indeed, there is a definite trend towards American predominance, and it seems likely that this will continue. There is certainly no reason now apparent why the 66.17% of our informants should begin to prefer a British pronunciation to an American one.

The 33.33% of our informants who have what I call a "free" pronunciation, neither one thing nor the other, will certainly diminish as time goes on. There is no reason now apparent for a strengthening of their existing British pronunciations. But there are plenty of reasons for a strengthening of their existing inclination to American pronunciation, with a loss of British variants. Of course, a great influx of British immigrants could change the picture completely.

It seems likely that a full survey of the speech of these same Albertans ten or twenty years from now will show the disappearance of "free" pronunciation and the establishment of a predominantly American pronunciation throughout the province. It is logical to suppose that syntax and vocabulary will show a similar American predominance. If this is so and if my initial thesis is good, the definition of an Albertan will not be hard to formulate. Similar surveys of other provinces should bring us close to a linguistic and cultural definition of a Canadian.⁵

⁵For an interesting comment on American influence on Canadian culture see W. Kirkconnell, *Canadian Toponymy and the Cultural Stratification of Canada*, *Onomastica* 7.

REVIEWS

Vie Française, a monthly review, Laval University, April 1954, Vol. 8, No. 7.

Reviewed by C. H. Moore and M. H. Scargill

This is our first acquaintance with this small but imposing review—imposing, in our opinion, by the importance of its documentary articles. Its purpose is to safeguard and invigorate the heritage of French Canada; and several articles are clearly written with this end. Most of them are closely related to the history of the French language in Canada.

Our attention was drawn, in particular, to a study by Dr. J. P. Vinay, University of Montréal: "*Aperçu des études de phonétique canadienne*", pp. 407-431.

Dr. Vinay begins by saying that no general study in Canadian phonetics has appeared since that by A. Rivard forty years ago. Today, work being done in Laval University and the University of Montréal is filling the gap.

Before turning to problems directly concerned with Canadian studies in phonetics, Dr. Vinay gives a brief survey of the present aims and nature of phonetics. New theories, new methods have shown the way to new goals. In linguistic geography the single worker has been replaced by whole teams. Such instruments as the electrokymograph have given the phonetician valuable aid in understanding and describing sounds. The University of Montréal, it should be noted, has probably the finest Experimental Phonetics Laboratory in Canada (*Reviewers*).

Dr. Vinay gives a brief, but very clear, review of the growth of phonetics and points out the necessity for a sound phonemic description of a language.

Dr. Vinay ends the first part of his survey by giving a useful diagram showing the scope of phonetic studies in general. He makes experimental phonetics the base from which rise phonemic studies, studies in the psychology of language, and studies in communications, etc.

The second part of the *Aperçu* reviews some of the work in phonemics, with particular reference to Canada, at the University of Montréal: e.g., the distribution of various supra-segmental phonemes in French-Canadian. Dr. Vinay suggests that in French-Canadian stress tends to fall on the penultimate syllable of words regardless of the nature of this syllable. Research at Montréal on vowel length shows a striking agreement between French-Canadian and French. But, as Dr. Vinay says, a full survey of these problems needs to be carried out for French-Canadian.

Dr. Vinay concludes his article with a discussion of the recently perfected acoustic spectrograph of the Bell Laboratory, which projects a frequency spectrum instantaneously and directly on a luminous screen. With such an instrument the University of Montréal has made numerous observations and verifications of the very pronounced velar resonance of certain final consonants in Naskapi, New England English, and French-Canadian.

As is customary, Dr. Vinay's work is extremely well presented. The article has also a brief but valuable amount of bibliographical material.

Reviewed by E. Morrison, U.B.C.

Professor Scargill himself says that his *English Handbook* "was written with the hope that it might encourage in our schools something of a scientific approach to the study of our language"; and from that approach, he hopes, there may issue a clear understanding of the language at its work of communication and expression. Any reasonable person who also happens to be intelligently concerned for the development of skill and tact in the use of our language can only sympathize with Dr. Scargill's hope and applaud his intention, which is indeed the unvarying aim of teachers of English composition everywhere.

A leading merit of Dr. Scargill's book, and one that should strongly recommend it to student and teacher both, is the canny choice of special topics. Out of his own experience as a teacher, and from the suggestions of many advisers, the author has hit the right matters for discussion. One may test this statement quickly by referring to Section 6 of the *Contents*, for instance, or to Section 9. But this deft selection of material, this driving always towards the essentials of the whole problem, only leads us toward a further and high merit of the book—the directness, the clarity, and the lack of equivocation that invariably mark the discussion of the matters so happily raised.

Keeping in mind the special groups for whom he was writing—high school students and entering university students—Dr. Scargill rightly decided to adopt that fruitful method of instruction which, by a clear statement of the *rationale* underlying a problem, leads to decision and to the statement of general principles. The success of this method is demonstrated throughout Section 29, the discussion of that "grammarful" part of speech, the pronoun. After analysis of a problem, young writers are grateful for a ruling in the light of that analysis. They know of their own uncertainty, their need of guidance, at least for the time being—and such guidance as they are likely to need, Dr. Scargill has tactfully supplied after allowing scope and run to youthful powers of judgement, an allowance which is in itself obviously of the highest pedagogic value.

By being thus, as it would seem, duly prescriptive, Dr. Scargill has rebuked the extravagances of the left-wingers amongst the "let-your-language-alone" party, who, it is the sad truth, have lately wrought a good deal of mischief in the teaching of English composition and the everyday handling of our mother tongue. At the same time, as Dr. Harold Allen of the University of Minnesota points out in his foreword, Dr. Scargill has been properly responsive to the work of "traditional grammarian" and "linguistic scientist" both—and in showing that these two are not necessarily at each other's throats, Dr. Scargill's book performs an incidental service not less valuable than its direct contribution to the teaching of young writers.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 1, 1914

